

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant has carefully considered this application in connection with the Examiner's Action and respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-20 in the application. The Applicant has amended Claims 1, 8 and 15 without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for these amendments can be found in FIGURE 2 and ¶ [0032] of the specification. Accordingly, Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application.

I. Formal Matters

The Applicant has provided an amended ¶ [0002] herein to include the application serial number of a cross-referenced patent application to Kramer, *et al.*, filed on January 9, 2002.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0085578 A1 to Dell, *et al.*, (“Dell”) in view of U.S. patent No. 6,667,983 B1 to Lo, *et al.*, (“Lo”). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because the cited combination does not teach each and every element of the claims.

Claims 1, 8 and 15 include the element “said n packet FIFOs configured as m subsets of packet FIFOs, each of said packet FIFOs in each of said subsets being coupled to a corresponding one of said m inputs.” The Applicant does not find any teaching of this element in Dell or Lo.

Moreover, the combination of Dell and Lo fails to suggest this element to one of ordinary skill in the art. Dell teaches a plurality of input devices 204, each coupled to one or more ingress line cards 202. (See FIGURE 2.) Within an input device 204, each input is coupled via an input MUX 406 to a buffer memory 408, where input cells are stored. (See FIGURE 4, ¶ [0107].) Selection of a cell for service is mediated by a bidding system. (See ¶ [0107].) One of ordinary skill in the art would find no use for the above-recited claim element in the context of Dell. Moreover, Lo is cited only for a priority summarizer and scheduler. (See Examiner's Action, pp. 4-5.) One of ordinary skill in the art would find no use for the above-recited claim element in the context of Lo.

Therefore, Dell and Lo contain no suggestion that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the above-recited claim element. Because the cited combination fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the Claims, the combination fails to sustain a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claims 1, 8 and 15. (See M.P.E.P. ¶ 2143.)

In view of the foregoing remarks, the cited references do not support the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-20.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC

/David H. Hitt/
David H. Hitt
Registration No. 33,182

Dated: June 22, 2006

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800